NSHSBETHINST 1540.3E
OA

0 8 APR 2002

NSHS BETHESDA INSTRUCTION 1540.3E

From: Commanding Officer

Subj: CLASS "C" SCHOOL INSTRUCTOR DEVELOPMENT AND OBSERVATION
      PROGRAM

Ref: (a) BUMEDINST 1540.2
       (b) NAVPERS 15905G
       (c) Curriculum Development Guide, Technical Training,
           Bureau of Medicine & Surgery (1996)
       (d) NSHSINST 1650.6E

Encl: (1) NSHS 1500/17 (Sep 97)
       (2) NSHS 1500/19 (Jul 98)
       (3) Instructor Development Flow Chart

1. **Purpose**. To provide guidance for the development and
recognition of instructors in the technical training Class "C"
schools.

2. **Cancellation**. NSHSBETHINST 1540.3D

3. **Applicability**. This instruction applies to the technical
training class "C" schools at the Naval School of Health
Sciences (NSHS), Bethesda.

4. **Background**.

    a. The primary purpose of instructor development is to
improve skills through training and constructive feedback based
on observed performance. Priority should be placed on assessing
each instructor's needs for further development and providing
supervision, support, guidance, training, and education to meet
those needs.

    b. The program will also identify instructors who, after
counseling, guidance, and supervision, are unable to effectively
teach or are unwilling to make the adjustments necessary to
perform effectively in the classroom environment. Each
instructor must present the highest professional standards as a

subject matter expert, classroom manager, and military role model.

c. Instructor development is crucial in assessing, evaluating, and modifying the total instructional process for effective student learning. Reference (a) provides guidance for formal instructor evaluation.

5. **Policy**.

a. **Instructor Development Process**.

(1) Instructor Training. Prior to presenting formal classroom instruction, all instructors should have successfully completed an instructor training course to receive the Navy Enlisted Classification Code 9502 as required by reference (b).

(2) Probationary Period. New instructors will be in a probationary status for a period of at least three months under the direct supervision of a seasoned instructor.

(3) Interview. The Academic Director, Head of Management and Specialty Training Department (MSTD), School Head, the Leading Chief Petty Officer (LCPO), and Instructional Systems Specialist (ISS) will meet with the prospective instructor. The ISS will discuss the instructor development program and assist in planning the Peer Evaluation Review Board (PERB).

(4) Peer Evaluation Review Board (PERB). Within three months after reporting and prior to the assignment of instructional duties, all instructors, including School Heads, will appear before a PERB. The School Head will assist in preparing the prospective instructor for the PERB. The PERB shall provide instructors with a supportive atmosphere in which to present a one-hour segment of their assigned subject area and provide constructive feedback. The Board composition shall normally include the School Head, ISS(s), and a minimum of two peers (consisting of technicians or clinical experts). Instructors from the same school may attend as subject matter experts. The PERB shall be conducted in accordance with the procedures established in paragraphs 5.b. (1) and 5.c.(1) below.

(5) Self Improvement Plan. The instructor and ISS, with assistance from the School Head, will develop a continuing self-improvement plan within one week (if needed) following the PERB or formal observation and critique. The plan will be recorded in the appropriate section of enclosure (1) and will be

available to the observer during subsequent formal observations and critiques. The observer will note progress in the instructor's plan for self-development and make other recommendations for improvement. The plan may be modified and updated by the Instructor, School Head, or ISS to comply with the mission and objectives of the training program. The School Head, ISS, and instructor will retain copies of the plan.

   b. **Observation Procedures**. The observation will cover at least one instructional period. Except during a PERB, the evaluator(s) should participate only if asked, display interest, avoid showing disapproval, and provide feedback to the instructor using enclosure (1). Videotaping may be used at the request of the instructor, School Head, and/or ISS.

   (1) <u>Peer Evaluation Review Board (PERB)</u>. The instructor will provide the ISS with a copy of the Lesson Topic Guide (LTG). All members of the PERB will actively participate and play the role of students.

   (2) <u>ISS Observation</u>. The ISS will monitor an instructional period using enclosure (1) and provide feedback to the instructor and School Head. If there is need for improvement, the instructor will be provided assistance by the ISS and then reevaluated within two weeks. The results of the observation will be provided to the instructor and the School Head.

   (3) <u>Other Evaluations</u>. The School Head will monitor an instructional period using enclosure (1) to provide feedback to the instructor. A copy of the review will be forwarded to the ISS. In addition, the School Head will complete the Technical Instructor Evaluation in reference (a) for each instructor on an annual basis to evaluate and provide feedback on the instructor's performance both in and outside the classroom as well as personal and professional development. Informal peer review may also use enclosure (1) or provide oral feedback to the instructor.

   (4) <u>Post Observation Critique</u>. At the end of the instructional period being evaluated, the observer should contact the instructor to discuss findings, identify strong points, and assist in taking corrective steps regarding any weaknesses. The results of the observation will be retained by the instructor, School Head, and ISS.

c. Observation Intervals

(1) <u>Newly Assigned Instructors</u>. New instructors must successfully pass a PERB prior to presenting formal classroom instruction. The new instructor shall be observed by the School Head and/or ISS during the first month of teaching and again during the first six months on the podium. It is recommended that the School Head or Senior Instructor closely monitor an instructor teaching any subject for the first time to ensure he/she is a subject matter expert and can motivate the class.

(2) <u>All Other Instructors</u>. Formal observations will be conducted semi-annually, once by the ISS and once by the School Head in accordance with reference (a). Informal peer observations should also occur within each school. Formal and informal observations should not coincide.

(3) <u>Informal Peer Review</u>. Informal peer reviews may be randomly conducted by an instructor with Master Training Specialist (MTS) designation from the same school throughout the course of instruction.

d. **Removal of an Instructor from the Podium**. In the event an instructor's performance is unsatisfactory, every effort will be made to help improve his/her teaching skills. The School Head, ISS, and instructor will formulate a plan of improvement to remediate the problem areas. The instructor will continue to instruct and will be monitored closely by the School Head and ISS to ensure that improvement is achieved. If the instructor does not improve after a reasonable period of time, action may be taken by the School Head to remove him/her from the podium. This will be a joint decision by the School Head, ISS, Department Head of MSTD and Academic Director. When an individual is considered unsuitable for continued duty as an instructor, a recommendation for removal from such duty will be submitted following the guidelines established in reference (b).

e. **Student Evaluation of Instruction**. At the end of a unit of instruction, an Education Technician will ask students to provide feedback on instruction, using enclosure (2). An Education Technician will compile the results, summarize student comments, and forward the information to an ISS for review. An ISS and/or Education Technician will discuss the results of the student critiques with the School Head. The School Head will discuss the critique results with the instructor(s). Student evaluation of clinical rotations shall be completed using

critiques as appropriate for the site/school. Critique results will be used to identify areas for improvement and recognition.

6. **Action**.

a. The Head, Curriculum, Standards and Evaluations Division shall:

(1) Ensure that all instructors are knowledgeable about the policies and responsibilities outlined in this instruction and reference (c).

(2) Coordinate the overall instructor development program using data collected from enclosures (1) and (2). The principal objectives are to enhance and refine instructor skills.

b. The School Heads shall:

(1) Consider enclosures (1) and (2) when preparing enlisted performance evaluations on instructors.

Promote instructor recognition using reference (d).

7. Enclosure (3) is the flow chart of the processes in this instruction.

D. S. WADE

Distribution:
List I & III (Less NNMC)

INSTRUCTOR EVALUATION

Instructor: _____   Date: _____
Evaluator: _____   Course: _____
Type of Eval: _____   Lesson Topic

Instructor's Overall Performance (Check One):

Satisfactory: Unsatisfactory: Needs Improvement

Scoring Key: YES = Satisfactory
                NI = Needs Improvement
                No = Applicable, but not done
                NA = Not applicable or not observed

Directions for Scoring: Place a check in the appropriate column
next to each item. In the "Comments" block for each section,
explain any items marked NI or No. Overall performance is
satisfactory if all applicable starred items are marked Yes, no
items are marked No, and no more than three unstarred items are
marked NI.

ESTABLISH CONTACT	YES	NI	No	NA
A. Greets class				
B. Introduces self (first class)				
C. Gives qualifications (first class)				

COMMENTS:

LESSON OVERVIEW	YES	NI	No	NA
A. Identifies lesson topic				
*B. States purpose and importance of lesson				
C. Explains learning objectives				
D. Identifies major points to be covered				

COMMENTS:

LESSON – CLASSROOM	YES	NI	No	NA
*A Follows LTG (Note: Reading the presentation from the LTG, except for clarity or precision, should result in an "NI" rating.)				
B. Uses appropriate examples in explanations				
C. Uses motivational factors				
*D. Maintains class control				
E. Maintains student interest				
*F. Demonstrates knowledge of subject matter				
G. Selects and uses media, aids, and equipment effectively				
*H. Demonstrates careful preparation				
I. Makes smooth transitions between teaching points				
J. Adjusts to unplanned situations				

COMMENTS:

COMPREHENSION CHECKS	YES	NI	No	NA
*A. Frequency				
B. Questions various students				
C. Uses effective questioning techniques				
D. Checks for recall of facts				
E. Checks for student comprehension				

COMMENTS:

2

PERSONAL TRAITS | YES | NI | No | NA |

A. Speaks in well-modulated voice | | | | | |

B. Uses correct language and grammar | | | | | |

C. Avoids distracting mannerisms | | | | | |

D. Maintains eye contact with class | | | | | |

E. Projects positive attitude | | | | | |

F. Demonstrates effective leadership | | | | | |

G. Demonstrates rapport with class | | | | | |

COMMENTS:

LABORATORY SESSION | YES | NI | No | NA |

*A. Identifies hazards and safety
    precautions | | | | | |

*B. Requires safe practices | | | | | |

*C. Provides constructive feedback

COMMENTS:

SUMMARY AND REVIEW | YES | NI | No | NA |

*A. Summarizes main points | | | | | |

B. Links lesson objectives to course
    objectives | | | | | |

*C. Checks for student comprehension | | | | | |

COMMENTS:

STUDENT BEHAVIOR	YES	NI	No	NA
A. Actively involved in class				
B. Interested in & attentive to lesson				

COMMENTS:

ADDITIONAL COMMENTS:

■ ■

I certify that this evaluation and comments have been reviewed with the instructor.

_____   _____
Evaluator's Signature   Date

_____   _____
Instructor's Signature   Date

COMMENTS:

* **

INSRUCTOR'S PLAN FOR GROWTH AND IMPROVEMENT
Plan should address any item marked NI or No.

NAVAL SCHOOL OF HEALTH SCIENCES, BETHESDA, MARYLAND
STUDENT EVALUATION OF INSTRUCTION

DIRECTIONS: Using the scales provided, rate each statement to best describe the unit of instruction overall that you have just completed. Your FEEDBACK is VITAL to the ongoing evaluation of this program.

SCALE FOR ITEMS 1-11:

NEVER   (2) SELDOM   (3) SOMETIMES   4) OFTEN   (5) ALWAYS

1. The *LEARNING OBJECTIVES* were clearly stated.   1 2 3 4 5

2. The unit presentation was well *ORGANIZED* and *EASY TO FOLLOW*.   1 2 3 4 5

3. The *EXAMINATIONS* tested the assigned material.   1 2 3 4 5

3. *TRAINING AIDS* (textbooks, audiovisual material, models, etc.) supported the unit of instruction.   1 2 3 4 5

4. The unit included adequate *EXAMPLES* and *DEMONSTRATIONS* to support the lecture material   1 2 3 4 5

5. The unit presentation allowed *ADEQUATE TIME* for *NOTETAKING*.   1 2 3 4 5

6. *FEEDBACK* on examinations and assignments was *SUFFICIENT* and *TIMELY*.   1 2 3 4 5

8. Student *PARTICIPATION* in class was *ENCOURAGED*.   1 2 3 4 5

9. The instructor was *AVAILABLE* for *ASSISTANCE*.   1 2 3 4 5

10. *HOMEWORK* assignments *SUPPORTED* class material.   1 2 3 4 5

11. The *DIDACTIC* and *LABORATORY* portions of the unit supported each other.   1 2 3 4 5

SCALE FOR ITEMS 12-15:

(1 STONGLY   (2) DISAGREE   (3) NEUTRAL   (4) AGREE   (5) STRONGLY
    DISAGREE   AGREE

12. The *GRADING SYSTEM* was fair and clearly   1 2 3 4 5
    explained.

    Sufficient *TIME* was allowed for mastering   1 2 3 4 5
    the objectives of the unit.

    The instructor displayed *PROFESSIONALISM*   1 2 3 4 5
    and *ETHICAL CONDUCT.*

15. The unit met the stated objectives (see #1).   1 2 3 4 5

* *

Again, your FEEDBACK is VITAL to the ongoing evaluation of the program. Please respond to the following questions. If you desire to comment on any numbered statements this form, do so in item #3. Please put the number of the question or statement to which you are responding to next to your response. You are ENCOURAGED to provide written comments for the unit to help support needed changes.

1. In your opinion, what could the instructor do to make the presentation of this unit more effective?

2. What strong points in the presentation of this unit of instruction would you like to see used in other units?

3. Other remarks:

NSHS 1500/19 (Jul 98)

INSTRUCTOR DEVELOPMENT FLOWCHART

```
                    ┌─────────────────────────────┐
                    │   Instructor Training School │
                    │          NEC 9502            │
                    └─────────────────────────────┘
                                   │
                                   ▼
                    ┌─────────────────────────────┐
                    │ Pre-PERB interview with Director,│
                    │ Dept Head, Instructional Systems │
                    │   Specialist (ISS) & LCPO        │
                    └─────────────────────────────┘
                                   │
┌──────────────────────┐          ▼
│ Continuing self-     │     ┌───────────┐
│ improvement plan     │────▶│   PERB    │
│ developed with School│     └───────────┘
│  Head (SH) & ISS     │          │
└──────────────────────┘          ▼
         ▲                    ╱──────────╲
         │         No        ╱   Does     ╲
         └──────────────────▕   instructor  ▏
                             ╲  pass PERB? ╱
                              ╲──────────╱
                                   │ Yes
                                   ▼
                    ┌─────────────────────────────┐
                    │  3-month probationary period │
                    └─────────────────────────────┘
                                   │
                                   ▼
                          ╱──────────────╲
                         ╱ Is performance  ╲          Yes
                        ▕  satisfactory on   ▏──────────────┐
                         ╲ semi-annual formal╱              │
                          ╲  observation?   ╱               ▼
                           ╲──────────────╱        ┌─────────────────┐
                                   │ No            │   SH & ISS      │
                                   ▼               │ monitor/evaluate│
                    ┌──────────────────────┐       │   instructor    │
                    │ Instructor writes    │       │ semi-annually   │
                    │ improvement plan with│       └─────────────────┘
                    │  SH & ISS assistance │               │
                    └──────────────────────┘               ▼
                                   │               ┌─────────────────┐
                                   ▼               │  No further     │
                                  (a)              │  action         │
                                                   └─────────────────┘
```

Enclosure (3)

```
                    ( a )
                      │
                      ▼
            ┌───────────────────┐
            │   SH & ISS monitor │
            │     instructor     │
            └───────────────────┘
                      │
                      ▼
                   ╱╲
                 ╱    ╲
               ╱        ╲
             ╱   Does     ╲          Yes
            ╲ instructor pass ╲──────────────┐
             ╱ re-evaluation? ╱              │
               ╲            ╱                 │
                 ╲        ╱                   │
                   ╲    ╱                     ▼
                    ╲╱               ┌──────────────────┐
                     │ No            │     SH & ISS      │
                     ▼               │  monitor/evaluate │
                   ╱╲                │    instructor     │
                 ╱    ╲              │   semi-annually   │
               ╱        ╲            └──────────────────┘
             ╱  Based upon ╲                  │
            ╱ documentation, ╲  No            ▼
           ╲ should instructor ╲─────┐  ┌──────────────┐
           ╱ be removed from  ╱      │  │ No further   │
            ╲  the podium?  ╱        │  │   action     │
               ╲          ╱          │  └──────────────┘
                 ╲      ╱
                   ╲  ╱
                    ╲╱
                     │ Yes
                     ▼
            ┌─────────────────────────┐
            │ Director, Dept Head, ISS &│
            │ SH recommend removal of   │
            │ instructor from podium    │
            └─────────────────────────┘
                     │
                     ▼
            ┌─────────────────────────┐
            │ CO removes instructor    │
            │     from podium          │
            └─────────────────────────┘
```